

Fact Sheets Supporting
Revision of the Section 303(d) List



September 2006

Table of Contents

NEW OR REVISED FACT SHEETS	3
LIST AS BEING ADDRESSED RECOMMENDATIONS	4
Alamo River.....	5
Sedimentation/Siltation	5
Selenium	6
Imperial Valley Drains	9
Sedimentation/Siltation	9
New River (Imperial)	10
Pathogens	10
Sediment.....	11
DELISTING RECOMMENDATIONS	12
Palo Verde Outfall Drain	13
Pathogens	13
ORIGINAL FACT SHEETS	15
LISTING RECOMMENDATIONS	16
Alamo River.....	17
Chlorpyrifos	17
DDT	19
Dieldrin	22
Polychlorinated biphenyls	25
Toxaphene	28
All American Canal.....	31
Specific Conductance	31
Sulfates	33
Total Dissolved Solids.....	35
Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel.....	37
Toxaphene	37
Colorado River (Imperial Reservoir to California-Mexico Border)	39
Selenium	39
Imperial Valley Drains	41
DDT	41
Dieldrin	44
Endosulfan	46
Polychlorinated biphenyls	48
Toxaphene	50
New River (Imperial)	52
Chlordane.....	52
Chlorpyrifos	54
DDT	56
Diazinon	59
Dieldrin	61

Mercury	63
Polychlorinated biphenyls	66
Selenium	68
Toxaphene	70
Toxicity	73
Palo Verde Outfall Drain	75
DDT	75

Colorado River Basin Region (7)

New or Revised Fact Sheets

New or Revised Fact Sheets

Colorado River Basin Region (7)

LIST AS BEING ADDRESSED

Recommendations to place waters and
pollutants on the Being Addressed
category of the section 303(d) List

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: Sedimentation/Siltation

Decision: List in Being Addressed Category

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	The Alamo River Sediment TMDL was approved by the RWQCB in 2001 and subsequently approved by USEPA in 2002.

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: Selenium

Decision: List in Being Addressed Category

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for delisting under sections 2.2, 4.6 and 4.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 4.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status while under section 4.5, a minimum of two lines of evidence are needed to assess listing status. Three lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment pollutant combination in the section 303(d) list Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category because a TMDL has been approved and is expected to result in attainment of the standard.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The tissue guideline used complies with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. None of 7 water samples exceeded the CTR criterion. The detection limit for these water samples is too high which makes it difficult to evaluate this data in terms of the Listing Policy. One of 27 tissue samples exceeded the fish consumption standard, and these do not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 4.1 of the Listing Policy. However, the number of samples is insufficient to determine with the confidence and power required by the Listing Policy.
5. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), FR - Freshwater Replenishment, SH - Shellfish Harvesting
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value is 2 µg/g for selenium.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	One of 27 samples for selenium in fish tissue taken between June 1978 and November 2000 exceeded the fish consumption standard (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected between June 1978 and November 2000.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substance Monitoring Program QAPP.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), FR - Freshwater Replenishment, SH - Shellfish Harvesting
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR: freshwater acute maximum is 20 ppb, freshwater chronic maximum is 5 ppb.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data were collected by the RWQCB on 6/21/2001 at 7 different stations on the Alamo River. All samples were non-detects with a detection limit of 100 ppb which is above the water quality objective and will not be used for the purpose of assessing compliance with the CTR (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected the following Alamo River sampling stations: AR-B (at the International Boundary), AR-D10 (Lower Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #10), AR-D8 (Central Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #8), AR-D6A (Holtville Main Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6A), AR-D6 (Rose Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6), AR-D3 (Central Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #3), and at AR-GRB.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were collected on 6/21/2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by North Coast Labs.

<i>Line of Evidence</i>	Remedial Program in Place
<i>Beneficial Use</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), FR - Freshwater Replenishment, SH - Shellfish Harvesting
<i>Information Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	TMDL completed (SWRCB, 2003).

Region 7

Water Segment: Imperial Valley Drains

Pollutant: Sedimentation/Siltation

Decision: List in Being Addressed Category

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: The Imperial Valley Drains sedimentation/siltation TMDL was approved by USEPA on September 30, 2005.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Pathogens

Decision: List in Being Addressed Category

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard. This water segment-pollutant combination was moved off the section 303(d) list during the 2002 listing cycle.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed portion of the section 303(d) list.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: The New River Pathogen TMDL was approved by the RWQCB in 2001 and approved by USEPA in 2002.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Sediment

Decision: List in Being Addressed Category

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for listing under section 2.2 of the Listing Policy. Under this section of the Policy, a minimum of one line of evidence is needed to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on the applicable factor, a TMDL has been developed and approved by USEPA and an approved implementation plan is expected to result in attainment of the standard.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification against removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category as it has not been demonstrated that standards have yet been attained.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information for this recommendation, SWRCB staff conclude that the water body should be placed in the Water Quality Limited Segments Being Addressed category of the section 303(d) list because a TMDL has been approved by USEPA and an implementation plan has been approved.

Lines of Evidence:

Line of Evidence Remedial Program in Place

Beneficial Use WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Information Used to Assess Water Quality: A TMDL and implementation plan has been approved for this water segment-pollutant combination. The New River Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL was approved by RWQCB on June 26, 2002 and subsequently approved by USEPA on March 31, 2003.

Colorado River Basin Region (7)

DELIST

Recommendations to remove waters
and pollutants from the
section 303(d) List

Region 7

Water Segment:	Palo Verde Outfall Drain
Pollutant:	Pathogens
Decision:	Delist
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This water body pollutant combination is being considered for removal from the section 303(d) list under section 4.2 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of removing this water segment-pollutant combination from the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy. 2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy. 3. Two of 41 water samples exceeded the water quality objective and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in table 4.2 of the Listing Policy. 4. Pursuant to section 4.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be removed from the section 303(d) list because it cannot be determined if applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	R1 - Water Contact Recreation
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: 400 MPN/100mL.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Forty-one water samples were collected from seven locations from 10/2000 to 08/2000. Only 2 of these samples exceeded the water quality objective (CRBRWQCB, 2006a).

Spatial Representation: Seven locations were sampled. The stations sampled were: LG-1, LG-2, LG-3, LG-4, LG-5, PVOD-1, and PVod-2.

Temporal Representation: Samples were taken from October 2000 to August 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Unknown.

Colorado River Basin Region (7)

Original

Fact Sheets

Fact Sheets Not Changed
from September 2005 Version

Colorado River Basin Region (7)

LIST

Recommendations to place waters and
pollutants on the section 303(d) List

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: Chlorpyrifos

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, the Alamo River is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances. Water toxicity has been documented in this water body and the pollutant is likely to cause or contribute to the toxic effect. Six of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Six of the 11 water samples exceeded the water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation:

After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem. This pollutant should replace the existing listing for Pesticides.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Department of Fish and Game guideline of 0.014 µg/L (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 4 water samples collected as part of SWAMP and 7 samples collected by USGS. Six of these 11 samples exceeded the evaluation guideline (SWAMP, 2004; LeBlanc et al. 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Seven stations were sampled, all situated along the Alamo River from the international boundary with Mexico to the outlet (mouth) of the Alamo River into the Salton Sea.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Four samples taken during the spring (May) and the fall (October) of 2002. Seven samples collected in April 2003, and the guideline was exceeded in 5 of them.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The Alamo River flows from Mexico through the Imperial Valley in the Salton Sea. Most of the water flowing through it comes from agricultural return flows.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP QAPP.

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, the Alamo River is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances. Tissue toxicity has been documented in this water body and the pollutant is likely to cause or contribute to the toxic effect. Eleven of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Eleven of the 11 tissue samples exceeded the water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. This addresses DDT and related pollutants.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR: freshwater acute maximum = 1.1 ppb for 4,4'DDT and freshwater chronic maximum = 0.001 ppb for 4,4'DDT as a 4-day average.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Samples were collected by the RWQCB on 6/21/2001 at 7 different stations. All samples were non-detects, with a detection limit of 0.1 ppb. Samples were also collected by the RWQCB on 4/15/2003 at 7 different stations. All samples were non-detects, with a detection limit of 0.018 ppb. Therefore, there were no exceedances of the total 14 samples (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected at the following Alamo River sampling stations: AR-B (at the International Boundary), AR-D10 (Lower Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #10), AR-D8 (Central Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #8), AR-D6A (Holtville Main Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6A), AR-D6 (Rose Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6), AR-D3 (Central Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #3), and at AR-GRB.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were collected on 4/15/2003 and 6/21/2001.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by North Coast Labs.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	100 ng/g (OEHHA Screening Value).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eleven out of 11 samples exceeded. A total of 6 file composite samples and 5 individual samples of carp and channel catfish were collected. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 2000, and 2002. Channel catfish were collected in 1993-94, 1996-98, and 2002. The guideline was exceeded in all samples. This addresses DDT and related pollutants (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Four stations along the Alamo River were sampled: upstream of Highway

78 crossing (Brawley), downstream of Sinclair Road (Calipatria), under the bridge at Highway 115 crossing (Holtville), and at the International Boundary to just downstream of Highway 98 (International Boundary).

Temporal Representation:

Samples were collected annually 1993-94, 1996-98, 2000, and 2002.

Data Quality Assessment:

Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, the Alamo River is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances. Tissue toxicity has been documented in this water body and the pollutant is likely to cause or contribute to the toxic effect. Ten of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Ten of the 11 tissue samples exceeded the water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The Alamo River from Holtville Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	USEPA: freshwater acute maximum = 0.24 ppb. USEPA: freshwater chronic maximum = 0.056 ppb.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data were collected by the RWQCB on 4/15/2003 and 6/21/01 at 7 different stations on the Alamo River. Of the 14 samples, all samples were non-detects and did not exceed either of the criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Alamo River from Holtville Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. Samples were collected at the following Alamo River sampling stations: AR-B (at the International Boundary), AR-D10 (Lower Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #10), AR-D8 (Central Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #8), AR-D6A (Holtville Main Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6A), AR-D6 (Rose Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6), AR-D3 (Central Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #3), and at AR-GRB.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were collected on 4/15/2003 and 6/21/01.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 2 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Ten out of 11 samples exceeded. A total of 5 filet composite and individual samples of carp and 6 filet composite and individual samples of channel catfish were collected. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 2000, and 2002. Channel catfish were collected in 1993-94, 1996-98, and 2002. The guideline was exceeded in all samples except a 2002 individual sample of carp (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation: The Alamo River from Holtville Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. Four stations along the Alamo River were sampled: upstream of Highway 78 crossing (Brawley), downstream of Sinclair Road (Calipatria), under the bridge at Highway 115 crossing (Holtville), and at the International Boundary to just downstream of Highway 98 (International Boundary). However, only the Alamo River at Calipatria station met the criteria in the Listing Policy.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected annually 1993-94, 1996-98, 2000, and 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 2.1, 3.6, and 3.9 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status while under section 3.9, a minimum of two lines of evidence are needed to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.6 the site has significant toxicity and the pollutant is likely to cause or contribute to the toxic effect. The benthic community is impacted and may be impacted by this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The sediment quality guideline used complies with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. None of the 7 samples exceeded the USEPA freshwater chronic and acute criteria, however 11 of 11 tissue samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and these exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The Alamo River from Central Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only should be placed on the list.
5. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	USEPA: freshwater acute total PCB's maximum = 2 ppb. USEPA: freshwater chronic total PCB's maximum = 0.014 ppb.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data were collected by the RWQCB on 6/21/2001 at 7 different stations on the Alamo River. Of the 7 samples, all samples were non-detects and did not exceed the criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Alamo River from Central Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. Samples were collected at the following Alamo River sampling stations: AR-B (at the International Boundary), AR-D10 (Lower Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #10), AR-D8 (Central Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #8), AR-D6A (Holtville Main Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6A), AR-D6 (Rose Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6), AR-D3 (Central Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #3), and at AR-GRB.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were collected on 6/21/2001.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by North Coast Labs.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 20 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eleven out of 11 samples exceeded. A total of 6 file composite samples and 5 individual samples of carp and channel catfish were collected. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 2000, and 2002. Channel catfish were collected in 1993-94, 1996-98, and 2002. The guideline was exceeded in all samples (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Alamo River from Central Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. Four stations along the Alamo River were sampled: upstream of Highway 78 crossing (Brawley), downstream of Sinclair Road

(Calipatria), under the bridge at Highway 115 crossing (Holtville), and at the International Boundary to just downstream of Highway 98 (International Boundary). Only the Alamo River from Central Drain to Calipatria met the criteria in the Listing Policy.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected annually 1993-94, 1996-98, 2000, and 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Alamo River

Pollutant: Toxaphene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, the Alamo River is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances. Tissue toxicity has been documented in this water body and the pollutant is likely to cause or contribute to the toxic effect. Eight of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Eight of the 11 tissue samples exceeded the water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The Alamo River from Central Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only should be placed on the list.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	USEPA: freshwater acute maximum = 0.73 ppb. USEPA: freshwater chronic maximum = 0.0002 ppb.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data were collected by the RWQCB on 4/15/2003 and 6/21/2001 at 7 different stations on the Alamo River. Of the 14 samples, all samples were non-detects and did not exceed either of the criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Alamo River from Central Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. Samples were collected at the following Alamo River sampling stations: AR-B (at the International Boundary), AR-D10 (Lower Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #10), AR-D8 (Central Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #8), AR-D6A (Holtville Main Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6A), AR-D6 (Rose Drain drainshed, at Drop Structure #6), AR-D3 (Central Alamo River drainshed, at Drop Structure #3), and at AR-GRB.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were collected on 4/15/2003 and 6/21/2001.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and North Coast Labs. A Quality Assurance Manual was also provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, PO - Hydroelectric Power Generation, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 30 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eight out of 11 samples exceeded. A total of 6 filet composite samples and 5 individual filet samples of carp and channel catfish were collected. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 2000, and 2002. Channel catfish were collected in 1993-94, 1996-98, and 2002. The guideline was exceeded in all samples except 1993 carp and channel catfish and 2002 carp samples (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation: The Alamo River from Central Drain to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. Four stations along the Alamo River were sampled: upstream of Highway 78 crossing (Brawley), downstream of Sinclair Road (Calipatria), under the bridge at Highway 115 crossing (Holtville), and at the International Boundary to just downstream of Highway 98 (International Boundary). Only the Alamo River from Central Drain to Calipatria should be placed on the list.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected annually 1993-94, 1996-98, 2000, and 2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: All American Canal

Pollutant: Specific Conductance

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Sixty five of 71 samples exceeded the California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level water quality objective and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

Evaluation Guideline: California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level = 900 micromhos for water supplied to the public, because this may adversely affect the taste, odor or appearance of drinking water. Upper Secondary MCL = 1,600 micromhos and Short Term MCL = 2,200 micromhos.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality:

Samples were collected by the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) once a year as part of the Annual Title 22 source water analysis from 1998 to 2003. Six of 6 samples were in exceedance of the recommended criterion (900 micromhos) and 0 of 6 were in exceedance of the upper or short term criteria. Samples were also collected monthly by the IID from 1998 to 2003. Fifty-nine of 65 samples were in exceedance of the recommended criterion (900 micromhos) and 1 of 65 samples were in exceedance of the upper and short term MCLs (1000 mg/L). Six samples were below all criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004a).

California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level = 900 micromhos for water supplied to the public, because this may adversely affect the taste, odor or appearance of drinking water. Upper Secondary MCL = 1,600 µmhos and Short Term MCL = 2,200 µmhos.

Spatial Representation:

Samples were collected from the All-American Canal at Drop # 4 and Drop #1.

Temporal Representation:

The 6 samples were collected once a year from 1998 through 2003. Samples were collected in June in 1998-1999, October in 2000-2002, and November in 2003. The 65 samples were collected once a month from 6/2/1998 through 1/12/2004.

Data Quality Assessment:

Imperial Irrigation District (IID) SOPs and Clinical Laboratory of San Bernardino (CLSB) QA Manual.

Region 7

Water Segment: All American Canal

Pollutant: Sulfates

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Fifty three of 66 samples exceeded the California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

Evaluation Guideline: California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level = 250 mg/L for water supplied to the public, because this may adversely affect the taste, odor or appearance of drinking water. Upper Secondary MCL = 500 mg/L and Short Term MCL = 600 mg/L.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Samples were collected monthly by the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) from the All-American Canal from 1998 through 2003. Fifty three of 66 samples were in exceedance of the recommended criterion (250 mg/L).

None of the 66 samples were in exceedance of the upper and short term MCLs (500 and 600 mg/L respectively). Thirteen samples were below all criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004a).

Spatial Representation: Samples were collected from the All-American Canal below Drop # 1.
Temporal Representation: Samples were collected once a month from 6/2/1998 through 1/12/2004.
QA/QC Equivalent: Imperial Irrigation District (IID) SOPs.

Region 7

Water Segment: All American Canal

Pollutant: Total Dissolved Solids

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Seventy of 71 samples exceed the California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.2 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: MU - Municipal & Domestic

Matrix: Water

Evaluation Guideline: California Code of Regulations: Recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level = 500 mg/L for water supplied to the public, because this may adversely affect the taste, odor or appearance of drinking water. Upper Secondary MCL = 1,000 mg/L and Short Term MCL = 1,500.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Samples were collected by the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) once a year as part of the Annual Title 22 source water analysis from 1998 through 2003. Six of 6 samples were in exceedance of the recommended

criterion (500 mg/L) and 0 of 6 were in exceedance of the upper and short term MCLs. Samples were also collected monthly by the IID from 1998 through 2003. Sixty-four of 65 samples were in exceedance of the recommended criterion (500 mg/L) and 1 of 65 were in exceedance of the upper and short term MCLs (1000 mg/L) (CRBRWQCB, 2004a).

Spatial Representation: Samples were collected from the All-American Canal at Drop # 4 and Drop #1.

Temporal Representation: For the 6 samples: samples were collected once a year from 1998 through 2003. Samples were collected in June in 1998-1999, October in 2000-2002, and November in 2003. For the 65 samples: samples were collected once a month from 6/2/1998 to 1/12/2004.

Data Quality Assessment: Imperial Irrigation District (IID) SOPs and Clinical Laboratory of San Bernardino (CLSB) QA Manual.

Region 7

Water Segment: Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel

Pollutant: Toxaphene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of the 8 samples exceeded the NAS Guideline and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel from Lincoln Street to the outlet into the Salton Sea only should be placed on the List.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Sediment

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: 100 ng/g [NAS Guideline (whole fish)].

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Three out of 8 samples exceeded. Four whole fish composite samples of red shiner, 3 whole fish composite samples of tilapia, and one composite sample of redbelly tilapia were collected. Red shiner were collected in 1992, 1995, and 2000-01. Tilapia were collected in 1996, 1999, and

2002. Redbelly tilapia were collected in 1995. The guideline was exceeded in 1996 tilapia and 2000-01 red shiner (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation:

The Coachella Valley Storm Channel from Lincoln Street to the outlet into the Salton Sea only. One station located at foot of Lincoln Street was sampled and was in exceedance.

Temporal Representation:

Samples were collected annually in 1992, 1995-96, 1999, and 2000-02.

Data Quality Assessment:

Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment:	Colorado River (Imperial Reservoir to California-Mexico Border)
Pollutant:	Selenium
Decision:	List
Weight of Evidence:	<p>This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.5 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.</p> <p>One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A sufficient number of samples exceed the 2 µg/g OEHHA tissue screening value guideline for Selenium. Under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy any water body segment where tissue pollutant levels in organisms exceed a pollutant specific evaluation guideline shall be placed on the section 303(d) list.</p> <p>Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.</p> <p>This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.2.The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.3.Three of 5 samples exceeded the OEHHA tissue-screening value of Selenium and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.4.Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.
SWRCB Staff Recommendation:	After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.
Lines of Evidence:	

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	AG - Agricultural Supply, CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 2 µg/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Three out of 5 samples exceeded (TSMP, 2002). A total of 5 filet samples of largemouth bass were collected. Bass were collected in 1992, 1999, and 2001-02. Bass exceeded the guideline in 1999 and 2001-02.
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two stations were sampled: about 2 miles downstream of the Needles Marina Resort and from Squaw Lake boat launch ramp to 1/4 mile north of Senator Lake.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually in 1992, 1999 and 2001-02.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 Data Report. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Imperial Valley Drains

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, Imperial Valley Drains is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Twelve of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Twelve of the 16 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. This addresses DDT and related pollutants. The Barbara Worth Drain, Peach Drain, and Rice Drain only.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	1000 ng/g [NAS Guideline (whole fish)].
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>This addresses DDT and related pollutants. Two mosquitofish samples exceeded the guideline out of a total of 5 samples. A total of 5 whole fish composite samples of mosquitofish and sailfin molly were collected. Two mosquitofish samples were collected in 2000 and 3 sailfin molly samples were collected in 1992, and 2001-02. Sailfin molly samples did not exceed the guideline (TSMP, 2002).</p> <p>Three out of 3 sailfin molly and mosquitofish samples were in exceedance of the guideline. A total of 3 whole fish composite samples were collected. One sailfin molly sample was collected in 1992 and 2 mosquitofish samples were collected in 1995-96.</p> <p>Three out of 3 mosquitofish samples were in exceedance of the guideline. A total of 3 whole mosquitofish samples were collected in 2001-02.</p> <p>Two out of 2 samples exceeded the guideline. One filet composite sample of carp was collected in 1999 and 1 individual filet sample of carp was collected in 2002.</p> <p>Two out of 3 samples exceeded the guideline. A total of 3 filet composite samples, 2 channel catfish and 1 tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected in 1999 and 2002. Tilapia were collected in 2000. The 2 channel catfish samples exceeded, not the tilapia sample.</p>
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	<p>The Barbara Worth Drain, Peach Drain, and Rice Drain only. For the 5 samples: 1 station located off Anderhold Road south of Highway S80 where drain comes alongside road. This information only applies to the Barbara Worth Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains.</p> <p>For the 3 samples collected in 1992 and 1995-96: 1 station located at HWY 115 crossing. This information only applies to the Peach Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains.</p> <p>For the 3 samples collected in 2002-02: 1 station located alongside headgate #101. This information only applies to the Rice Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains.</p> <p>For the 2 samples collected: 1 station located downstream of Meloland Road. This information only applies to the Central Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains.</p>

For the 3 samples collected in 1999, 2000 and 2002: 1 station location upstream from the last head gate on the drain. This information only applies to the Holtville Main Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drain.

Temporal Representation:

Samples were collected in 1992, 1995-96, 1999, 2001 and 2000-02.

Data Quality Assessment:

Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 Data Report.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Imperial Valley Drains

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Six of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Six of the 8 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Only one station at Barbara Worth Drain and one station at Fig Drain should be placed on the List.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 2 ng/g and NAS Guideline (whole fish) and 100 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>Two out of 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA value. One filet composite sample (1999) and one individual sample (2002) of carp were collected. The guideline was exceeded in both samples. Two of 3 samples exceeded the NAS guideline. A total of 3 whole fish composite samples of sailfin molly and mosquitofish were collected. One sailfin molly sample was collected in 1992 and 2 mosquitofish samples were collected in 1995-96. The NAS guideline was exceeded in the sailfin molly and in 1 mosquitofish sample (TSMP, 2002).</p> <p>Two out of 3 samples were in exceedance of the NAS guideline. A total of 3 whole fish composite samples of mosquitofish were collected in 2001-02. The guideline was exceeded in 2001 and 2002 samples.</p>
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Barbara Worth Drain and Fig Drain only. For the 2 carp samples: 1 station located downstream of Meloland Road. This information only applies to the Central Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains. For the 3 samples collected in 1992 and 1995-96: 1 station located at HWY 115 crossing. This information only applies to the Peach Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains. For the 3 samples collected in 2001-02: 1 station located alongside headgate #101. This information only applies to the Rice Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains. Only one station at Barbara Worth Drain and one station at Fig Drain should be placed on the list.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected 12/5/99 and 10/22/02; 1992 and 1995-96; and 2001-02.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	<p>Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.</p> <p>Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.</p>

Region 7

Water Segment: Imperial Valley Drains

Pollutant: Endosulfan

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Two of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 3 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. One station located at the highway 115 crossing and Peach Drain was in exceedance.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	NAS Guideline (whole fish) 100 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 3 samples exceeded the criteria. A total of 2 whole fish composite samples of mosquitofish and one of sailfin molly and were collected. Sailfin molly were collected in 1992 and the mosquitofish in 1995-96. The guideline was exceeded in sailfin molly and one of the two mosquitofish samples (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Peach Drain only. One station located at the highway 115 crossing and Peach Drain was in exceedance. This information only applies to the Peach Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected in 1992 and 1995-96.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Imperial Valley Drains

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The Central Drain from Meloland Rd. to the outlet into the Alamo River only should be placed on the List.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: OEHHA Screening Value 20 ng/g.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Two out of 2 samples exceeded. One filet composite sample (1999) and one individual filet sample (2002) of carp were collected. The guideline was exceeded in both samples (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation: The Central Drain from Meloland Rd. to the outlet into the Alamo River

only. One station located downstream of Meloland Road was sampled. This information only applies to the Central Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains. Only the Central Drain downstream of Meloland Road station should be placed on the list.

Temporal Representation:

Samples were collected 12/5/99 and 10/22/02.

Data Quality Assessment:

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: Imperial Valley Drains

Pollutant: Toxaphene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Ten of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Ten of the 10 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The Barbara Worth Drain, Peach Drain, and Rice Drain only should be listed.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	NAS Guideline (whole fish) 100 ng/g and OEHHA Screening Value 30 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	<p>Five out of 5 samples exceeded the NAS guideline. A total of 5 whole fish composite samples of mosquitofish and sailfin molly were collected. Two mosquitofish samples were collected in 2000 and 3 sailfin molly samples were collected in 1992 and 2001-02. The guideline was exceeded in all samples (TSMP, 2002).</p> <p>Two out of 2 samples exceeded the OEHHA guideline. One filet composite sample (1999) and 1 individual filet sample (2002) of carp were collected. Both samples were in exceedance.</p> <p>Three out of 3 samples exceeded the NAS guideline. A total of 3 whole fish composite samples of sailfin molly and mosquitofish were collected. One sailfin molly sample was collected in 1992 and 2 mosquitofish samples were collected in 1995-96. The guideline was exceeded in all samples.</p>
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The Barbara Worth Drain, Peach Drain, and Rice Drain only. For the 5 samples: 1 station located off Anderhold Road south of Highway S80 where drain comes alongside road. This information only applies to the Barbara Worth Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains. For the 2 samples: 1 station located downstream of Meloland Road. This information only applies to the Central Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains. For the 3 samples: One station located at highway 115 crossing. This information only applies to the Peach Drain area of the Imperial Valley Drains.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected on 12-5-1999, 10/22/2002, in 1992, 1995-1996 and 2000-2002.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	<p>Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 Data Report.</p> <p>Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.</p> <p>Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.</p>

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Chlordane

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Five of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Five of the 13 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* CTR: freshwater acute maximum = 2.4 ppb and CTR: freshwater chronic maximum = 0.0043 ppb as a 4-day average.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Data were collected by the RWQCB at four locations on the New River in 2003. Of the 4 samples, all samples were non-detects with a detection limit of 0.025 ppb. Therefore, there were no exceedances (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).

Spatial Representation: Data were collected at four locations on the New River, from the international boundary to the outlet to the Salton Sea.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected on 4/17/2003.

QA/QC Equivalent: Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: OEHHA Screening Value 30 ng/g.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Five out of 13 samples exceeded. A total of 7 file composite and individual samples of channel catfish, 5 composite and individual samples of carp, and one composite of tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected in 1992-93, 1995, 1997-98, and 2001-02. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 1997, and 1999. Tilapia were collected in 1996. Carp and channel catfish samples exceeded the guideline in 1992-94. A channel catfish sample exceeded the guideline in 2002 (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation: Two stations on the New River were sampled: at the gauging station about one mile downstream of the Lack Road Bridge near Westmorland and near the international boundary.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected during the period of 1992-1999 and 2001-02.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Chlorpyrifos

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in water. Two of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Two of the 9 water samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Guideline from the Department of Fish and Game of 0.014 µg/L used (Siepmann and Finlayson, 2000).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 4 water samples from SWAMP and 5 water samples taken by USGS. Two of nine samples exceeded the evaluation guideline (SWAMP, 2004; LeBlanc, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Five stations were sampled. All were situated along the New River from the international boundary with Mexico to the outlet (mouth) of New River in the Salton Sea. Exceedances were observed at the Evans Hewes Highway and the Rice Drain stations.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Four samples were taken during the spring (May) and the fall (October) of 2002. No exceedances were observed. Of the five samples collected in April 2003, two exceeded the evaluation guideline.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The New River flows from Mexico through the Imperial Valley in the Salton Sea. Most of the water flowing through it comes from agricultural return flows.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP QAPP.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Eleven of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Eleven of the 13 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. This addresses DDT and related pollutants.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	CTR: freshwater acute maximum = 1.1 ppb for 4,4'DDT and freshwater chronic maximum = 0.001 ppb for 4,4'DDT as a 4-day average.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data were collected by the RWQCB at four locations on the New River in 2003. None of the 4 samples exceeded the acute maximum, however 3 samples were below the detection limit (0.018 ppb) and 1 was above (0.13 ppb) the chronic maximum (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Data were collected at four locations on the New River, from the international boundary to the outlet to the Salton Sea.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected on 4/17/2003.
<i>QA/QC Equivalent:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	100 ng/g (OEHA Screening Value; Brodberg, 1999).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Eleven out of 13 samples exceeded. A total of 7 filet composite and individual samples of channel catfish, 5 filet composite and individual samples of carp, and one filet composite of tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected from 1992-99 and 2001-02. Carp were collected 1993-4, 1997, and 1999. Tilapia were collected in 1996. The guideline was exceeded in all samples except tilapia and a 1997 individual carp sample. This addresses DDT and related pollutants (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two stations, one station was located at the gauging station about one mile downstream of the Lack Road Bridge near Westmorland and the second station was located near the international boundary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected annually 1992-99 and 2001-02.

Data Quality Assessment:

Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Diazinon

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in water. Three of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Three of the 9 water samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	DFG Evaluation guideline of 0.10 µg/L (Siepmann & Finlayson, 2000; Finlayson, 2004).
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Numeric data generated from 4 water samples from SWAMP and 5 water samples from USGS. Three of 9 samples exceeded the evaluation guideline (LeBlanc, et al. 2004; SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Five stations were sampled. All were situated along the New River from the international boundary with Mexico to the outlet (mouth) of New River in the Salton Sea. The boundary station had two exceedances and the outlet had one exceedance.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Four samples were taken during the spring (May) and the fall (October) of 2002. Exceedances at both stations occurred in the fall sampling event. Five samples were collected in April 2003 and the diazinon concentration exceeded the evaluation guideline in one sample.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The New River flows from Mexico through the Imperial Valley in the Salton Sea. Most of the water flowing through it comes from agricultural return flows.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP QAPP.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Dieldrin

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Ten of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Ten of the 13 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* USEPA: freshwater acute maximum = 0.24 ppb and freshwater chronic maximum = 0.056 ppb as a 4-day average.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Data were collected by the RWQCB at four locations on the New River in 2003. All samples were non-detects with a detection limit of 0.012 ppb. Therefore, there were no exceedances (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).

Spatial Representation: Data were collected at four locations on the New River, from the international boundary to the outlet to the Salton Sea.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected on 4/17/2003.

QA/QC Equivalent: Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: OEHHA Screening Value 2 ng/g.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Ten out of 13 samples exceeded. A total of 7 filet composite and individual samples of channel catfish, 5 filet composite and individual samples of carp, and one filet composite of tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected from 1992-1999 and 2001-2002. Carp were collected 1993-1994, 1997, and 1999. Tilapia were collected in 1996. The guideline was exceeded in all samples except tilapia and 1994 and 1997 carp samples (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation: Two stations, one station located at the gauging station about one mile downstream of the Lack Road Bridge near Westmorland and the second station located near the international boundary.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected annually 1992-1999 and 2001-2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-1993 and 1994-1995 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Mercury

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.1 and 3.5 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 and 3.5 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Two tissue samples exceeded the tissue guideline.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The sediment quality guideline used complies with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. Four of 113 water samples exceed the USEPA: freshwater chronic and acute guideline and this does not exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1, however 2 of 12 fish tissue samples exhibit toxicity exceeding the fish consumption standard, and these exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. The New River from the International Boundary to the USGS Station in Calexico only.
5. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	USEPA: freshwater chronic maximum = 0.77 ppb as a 4-day average and freshwater acute maximum = 1.4 ppb.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Samples were collected monthly by the RWQCB from June 1995 to December 2003. Of the 98 monthly samples, 2 were in exceedance of the chronic criteria and 1 was in exceedance of the acute criteria. Samples were also collected by the RWQCB at 3 locations from 6/11/1996 to 12/4/1996. None of these 6 samples were in exceedance. Samples were also collected by the RWQCB from 10/31/1999 to 11/6/1999. One of these 9 samples was in exceedance of the acute criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The New River from the International Boundary to the USGS Station in Calexico only. The 98 and 9 samples were collected on the New River at the International Boundary. The 6 samples were collected on the New River at the International Boundary at the International Drain, and at the Puente Madero.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The 98 samples were collected monthly from June 1995 through December 2003. The 6 samples were collected on 6 days from 6/11/1996 to 12/4/1996. The 9 samples were collected monthly from 10/31/1999 to 11/6/1999.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	For the 98 samples, temperature, pH, D.O., and conductivity were also measured.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 0.3 µg/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Two out of 12 samples exceeded. A total of 7 file composite and individual samples of channel catfish, 4 composite and individual samples of carp, and one composite of tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected in 1992-93, 1995, 1997-98, and 2001-02. Carp were collected in 1993-94 and 1997. Tilapia were collected in 1996. Two composite samples of carp in 1993-94 exceeded the guideline (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	The New River from the International Boundary to the USGS Station in Calexico only. Two stations on the New River were samples: at the gauging station about one mile downstream of the Lack Road Bridge near Westmorland and near the international boundary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected during the period of 1992-1998 and 2001-02.

Data Quality Assessment:

Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Polychlorinated biphenyls

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.1 and 3.5 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 and 3.5 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status. Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The sediment quality guideline used complies with the requirements of section 6.1.3 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
3. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
4. None of 107 samples exceeded the USEPA: freshwater acute and chronic criteria. However, 10 of 13 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value, and these do exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
5. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* USEPA: freshwater acute total PCBs maximum = 2 ppb and freshwater chronic maximum as a 4-day average based on hardness.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Data were collected by the RWQCB on 6/21/2001 at 9 different stations on the New River. All 9 samples were non-detects. There were no

exceedances. Samples were also collected by the RWQCB from June 1995 to December 2003. None of these 98 samples were in exceedance (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).

<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Samples were collected on the New River at the International Boundary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	The 9 samples were collected on 6/21/2001 and the 98 samples were collected monthly from June 1995 to December 2003.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	For the 98 samples, temperature, pH, D.O., and conductivity were also measured.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by North Coast Labs.

<i>Numeric Line of Evidence</i>	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 20 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Ten out of 13 samples exceeded. A total of 7 filet composite and individual samples of channel catfish, 5 filet composite and individual samples of carp, and one filet composite of tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected in 1992-93, 1995, 1997-98, and 2001-02. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 1997, and 1999. Tilapia were collected in 1996. A 1994 carp sample, a 1995 channel catfish sample, and the 1996 tilapia sample had no detectable levels of PCB (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two stations on the New River were sampled: at the gauging station about one mile downstream of the Lack Road Bridge near Westmorland and near the international boundary.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected during the period of 1992-1999 and 2001-02.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game. Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Selenium

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.1 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. A large number of samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Fourteen of 117 samples exceeded the water quality criteria and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards for the pollutant are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Water

Beneficial Use: FR - Freshwater Replenishment, IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat

Matrix: Water

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* USEPA: freshwater chronic maximum = 5 ppb as a 4-day average.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Samples were collected by the RWQCB from June 1995 through December 2003. Of the 98 monthly samples, 8 were in exceedance of the chronic criteria and 2 were in exceedance of the USEPA: freshwater

acute maximum. Four samples were also collected during the spring and fall of 2002 and numerical data was generated from them. All four samples exceeded the CTR: 5 µg/L criterion. Samples were also collected by the RWQCB at three locations from 6/11/96 through 12/4/96. None of these 6 samples were in exceedance of the USEPA: freshwater acute maximum. Samples were collected by the RWQCB from 10/31/99 through 11/6/99. None of these 9 samples were in exceedance of the USEPA: freshwater acute maximum (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).

- Spatial Representation:* Samples were collected on the New River at the International Boundary. The 6 samples were collected on the New River at the International Boundary, a the International Drain, and at Puente Madero. The 4 samples were samples at 2 stations, one at the International Boundary with Mexico and the other at the outlet (mouth) of the New River into the Salton Sea.
- Temporal Representation:* The 98 samples were collected monthly from June 1995 through December 2003. The 6 samples were collected on 6 days from 6/11/1996 to 12/4/1996, the 9 samples were collected monthly from 10/31/1999 to 11/6/1999, and the 4 samples were collected during the spring and fall of 2002.
- Environmental Conditions:* For the 98 samples, temperature, pH, D.O., and conductivity were also measured.
- Data Quality Assessment:* Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided. And the SWAMP QAPP was also used.
-

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Toxaphene

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under sections 3.5, and 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Currently, New River (Imperial) is listed for pesticides. It is not possible, in a general listing, to determine which specific pollutant is causing or contributing to water quality impacts. There is sufficient justification for removing the general listings for pesticides from the 303(d) list and replace these general listings with the specific pollutants when found to be exceeding.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.5 and 3.6, the site does exhibit exceedances in tissue. Seven of the samples exceed the water quality objective.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Seven of the 17 tissue samples exceeded the water quality criteria, and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy. Only the New River at Westmoreland station should be placed on the list.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination be placed on the section 303(d) list because water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Water
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	USEPA: freshwater acute maximum = 0.73 ppb and chronic maximum = 0.0002 ppb as a 4-day average.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Data were collected by the RWQCB at 4 locations on the New River. All samples were below the detection limit (0.760 ppb), which is greater than the acute and chronic criteria. Therefore, the data cannot be assessed in comparison to the chronic criteria (CRBRWQCB, 2004c).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Data were collected at four locations on the New River, from the international boundary to the outlet to the Salton Sea.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	Samples were collected on 4/17/2003.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	Used RWQCB QA/QC in sample collection. Lab analysis was done by E.S. Babcock & Sons laboratory and a Quality Assurance Manual was provided.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Pollutant-Tissue
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA), IN - Industrial Service Supply, R1 - Water Contact Recreation, R2 - Non-Contact Recreation, RA - Rare & Endangered Species, WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat, WI - Wildlife Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Tissue
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be presenting concentration that adversely affect beneficial uses.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	OEHHA Screening Value 30 ng/g.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Seven out of 13 samples exceeded. A total of 7 file composite and individual samples of channel catfish, 5 composite and individual samples of carp, and one composite of tilapia were collected. Channel catfish were collected in 1992-93, 1995, 1997-98, and 2001-02. Carp were collected in 1993-94, 1997, and 1999. Tilapia were collected in 1996. Channel catfish samples exceeded the guideline in 1993, 1995, 1997-98 2001-02. Carp exceeded in 1999. Only the New River at Westmoreland station met the criteria in the Listing Policy (TSMP, 2002).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Two stations on the New River were sampled: at the gauging station about one mile downstream of the Lack Road Bridge near Westmorland and near the international boundary. Only the New River at Westmoreland station should be placed on the list.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected during the period of 1992-1999 and 2001-02.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.

Region 7

Water Segment: New River (Imperial)

Pollutant: Toxicity

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.6 of the Listing Policy. Under section 3.6 a single line of evidence is necessary to assess listing status.

Two lines of evidence are available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant. Based on section 3.6 the site has significant sediment and water toxicity. While many pollutants are found in this water body it is uncertain which cause these effects.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Four of 4 samples exhibit sediment toxicity and 3 of 3 samples exhibit water toxicity. These exceed the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Toxicity

Beneficial Use: WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat

Matrix: Sediment

***Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:*** Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations which are toxic to, or which produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or indigenous aquatic life.

Evaluation Guideline: Significant toxicity as compared to control.

<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Toxicity testing data generated from 4 sediment samples. Four of these samples were toxic (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three stations were sampled, all were situated along the New River from the international boundary with Mexico to the outlet (mouth) of New River into the Salton Sea.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were taken between the spring (May) and the fall (October) of 2002. Toxicity was detected during both seasons.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The New River flows from Mexico through the Imperial Valley in the Salton Sea. Most of the water flowing through it comes from agricultural return flows.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP QAPP.

Numeric Line of Evidence	Toxicity
<i>Beneficial Use:</i>	WA - Warm Freshwater Habitat
<i>Matrix:</i>	Water
<i>Water Quality Objective/ Water Quality Criterion:</i>	Basin Plan: All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations which are toxic to, or which produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or indigenous aquatic life.
<i>Evaluation Guideline:</i>	Significant toxicity as compared to control.
<i>Data Used to Assess Water Quality:</i>	Toxicity testing data generated from 3 water samples. Three of these samples were toxic (SWAMP, 2004).
<i>Spatial Representation:</i>	Three stations were sampled, all were situated along the New River from the international boundary with Mexico to the outlet (mouth) of New River into the Salton Sea.
<i>Temporal Representation:</i>	All samples were taken between the spring (May) and the fall (October) of 2002. Toxicity was detected during both seasons.
<i>Environmental Conditions:</i>	The New River flows from Mexico through the Imperial Valley in the Salton Sea. Most of the water flowing through it comes from agricultural return flows.
<i>Data Quality Assessment:</i>	SWAMP QAPP.

Region 7

Water Segment: Palo Verde Outfall Drain

Pollutant: DDT

Decision: List

Weight of Evidence: This pollutant is being considered for placement on the section 303(d) list under section 3.5 of the Listing Policy. One line of evidence is available in the administrative record to assess this pollutant.

Based on the readily available data and information, the weight of evidence indicates that there is sufficient justification in favor of placing this water segment-pollutant combination on the section 303(d) list in the Water Quality Limited Segments category.

This conclusion is based on the staff findings that:

1. The data used satisfies the data quality requirements of section 6.1.4 of the Policy.
2. The data used satisfies the data quantity requirements of section 6.1.5 of the Policy.
3. Four of the 11 samples exceeded the OEHHA Screening Value and this exceeds the allowable frequency listed in Table 3.1 of the Listing Policy.
4. Pursuant to section 3.11 of the Listing Policy, no additional data and information are available indicating that standards are not met.

SWRCB Staff Recommendation: After review of the available data and information, SWRCB staff concludes that the water body-pollutant combination should be placed on the section 303(d) list because applicable water quality standards are exceeded and a pollutant contributes to or causes the problem.

Lines of Evidence:

Numeric Line of Evidence Pollutant-Tissue

Beneficial Use: CM - Commercial and Sport Fishing (CA)

Matrix: Tissue

*Water Quality Objective/
Water Quality Criterion:* Colorado River Basin RWQCB Basin Plan: No individual chemical or combination of chemicals shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

Evaluation Guideline: OEHHA Screening Value 100 ng/g.

Data Used to Assess Water Quality: Four out of 11 samples exceeded. A total of 10 filet composite samples and one individual sample of largemouth bass, carp, channel catfish, and flathead catfish were collected. Carp were collected in 1992 and 1995. Channel catfish were collected in 1995. Flathead catfish were collected in 1992 and 2000. The 2000 sample of flathead was the lone individual sample. Largemouth bass were collected in 1995-96 and 1998-2002. The

guideline was exceeded in the 1992 and 1995 carp samples, the 1992 fathead sample, and the 1995 channel catfish sample. Largemouth bass did not exceed the guideline (TSMP, 2002).

Spatial Representation: One station located from the boat ramp off Clark Way in Palo Verde downstream 3/4 of a mile was sampled.

Temporal Representation: Samples were collected annually 1992, 1995-96, 1998-2002.

Data Quality Assessment: Toxic Substances Monitoring Program 1992-93 and 1994-95 Data Reports.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 1996-2000. Department of Fish and Game.

Environmental Chemistry Quality Assurance and Data Report for the Toxic Substances Monitoring Program, 2001-2002. Department of Fish and Game.
